UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/690,525 | 10/23/2003 | Masahiro Kamiya | 117605 | 6376 |

25944 7590 09/07/2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| OFURUM, NNENNA N | |
| **ART UNIT** | **PAPER NUMBER** |
| 2623 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 09/07/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/690,525 | KAMIYA, MASAHIRO | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Nnenna N. Ofurum | 2623 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/23/2003.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

2. The reference listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 23, 2003 has been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449 form).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-4, 6-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US Patent Number 6,437,836) in view of Nagasaka et al. (US Publication Number 2004/0085352).

Regarding **claim 1**, Huang et al. discloses an electronic program guide display control apparatus for displaying a part of an electronic program guide on a display screen (see fig 5). Huang et al. fails to disclose the claimed specification position detection unit and scroll control unit.

Nagasaka et al. teaches scrolling the display of a display area in response to specification position on the display screen (see fig 46, paragraphs 0147 and 0405) the electronic program guide display control apparatus comprising:

Nagasaka et al. discloses a specification position detection unit for detecting a specification position on the display screen (see paragraph 0029); and

a scroll control unit for scrolling the display of the display area based on a positional relation between the specification position detected by the specification position detection unit and a predetermined position on the display screen (see paragraph 0362 and 0404).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang et al.'s invention in view Nagasaka et al. for the advantage of providing a screen operating device with good operability.

Regarding **claim 2**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus (see fig 5).

Nagasaka et al. discloses the apparatus wherein the specification position detection unit detects a position on the display screen pressed by a user with the user's finger as the specification position (see abstract, lines 1-5 and paragraphs 0029 and 0033).

Regarding **claim 3**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 2*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus (see fig 5).

Nagasaka et al. discloses the apparatus wherein the scroll control unit scrolls the display of the display area based on the positional relationship between the specification position detected by the specification position detection unit and a center position of the display screen (see paragraphs 0362-0363).

Regarding **claim 4**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 3*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus (see fig 5).

Nagasaka et al. discloses the apparatus wherein the scroll control unit scrolls the display of the display area based on of a direction from the center position to the specification position and at least one of a distance from the center position to the specification position and specification pressure at the specification position (see paragraphs 0011, 0018 and 0362).

Regarding **claim 6**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus further comprising: a broadcast-service-unit regulation unit for regulating a move distance in broadcast service units (see fig 5 (502), column 3, lines 27-29 and column 5, lines 62-63).

Nagasaka et al. discloses regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit (see paragraph 0362).

Regarding **claim 7**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus further comprising: a time-unit regulation unit for regulating a move distance in predetermined time units (see fig 5 (505) and column 5, lines 54-63).

Nagasaka et al. discloses regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit (see paragraph 0362).

Regarding **claim 8**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus further comprising: a broadcast-service-unit regulation unit for regulating a move distance in broadcast service units (see fig 5 (503), column 3, lines 27-29 and column 5, lines 62-63).

Nagasaka et al. discloses regulating a move distance of the scrolling by the scroll control unit (see paragraph 0362).

Regarding **claim 9**, Huang et al. discloses an electronic program guide display control method comprising (see fig 5):

displaying a part of an electronic program guide on a display screen (see fig 5, column 4, lines 55-56 and column 8, lines 32-35) and scrolling a display area of the electronic program guide (see fig 5 (506 and 507) and column 8, lines 38-44). However, Huang et al. fail to specifically disclose detecting a specification position on the display screen and scrolling based on a positional relationship between the specification position detected and a predetermined position on the display screen.

Nagasaka et al. discloses detecting a specification position on the display screen (see paragraph 0029), and scrolling based on a positional relationship between the specification position detected and a predetermined position on the display screen (see paragraph 0362 and 0404).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Nagasaka et al. for the advantage of easily manipulating the display screen.

Regarding **claim 10**, Huang et al. discloses an electronic program guide display control program for causing a computer to perform a process comprising (see fig 5):

displaying a part of an electronic program guide on a display screen (see fig 5, column 4, lines 55-56 and column 8, lines 32-35) and scrolling a display area of the electronic program guide (see fig 5 (506 and 507) and column 8, lines 38-44). However, Huang et al. fail to specifically disclose detecting a specification position on

the display screen and scrolling based on a positional relationship between the specification position detected and a predetermined position on the display screen.

Nagasaka et al. discloses detecting a specification position on the display screen (see paragraph 0029), and scrolling based on a positional relationship between the specification position detected and a predetermined position on the display screen (see paragraph 0362 and 0404).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Nagasaka et al. for the advantage of easily manipulating the display screen.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang et al. (US Patent Number 6,437,836) as applied to *claim 4* above, and further in view of Nagasaka et al. (US Publication Number 2004/0085352) and Nakajima et al. (US Patent Number 7,061,648).

Regarding **claim 5**, Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 4*). Huang et al. discloses the electronic program guide display control apparatus (see fig 5).

Nagasaka et al. discloses the specification position detected by the specification position detection unit (see paragraph 0029). However, Nagasaka et al. and Huang et al. fail to specifically disclose an end portion of the display screen wherein the scroll control unit displays content of an end portion positioned in a direction from the center position to the specification position on the display screen.

Nakajima et al. discloses an end portion of the display screen wherein the scroll control unit displays content of an end portion positioned in a direction from the center position to the specification position on the display screen (see fig 14 and column 15, lines 60-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Huang et al. and Nagasaka et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Nakajima et al. in order to visibly notify the viewer when the screen session has ended.

### *Citation of Pertinent Prior Art*

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Bisset et al**. (US Patent Number 5,543,588)

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nnenna N. Ofurum whose telephone number is 571-270-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NNO/nno
August 24, 2007

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600